

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANIBAL RODRIGUEZ, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. [20-cv-04688-RS](#) (AGT)

**DISCOVERY ORDER**

Re: Dkt. No. 216

The plaintiffs want to share with eleven new consulting experts documents that Google produced and designated as confidential or highly confidential. Google objects.

As required by the protective order, the plaintiffs have explained why it is “reasonably necessary” for them to share Google’s protected materials with their experts. Dkt. 70 ¶ 7.5(c). These are “trusted consultants” with whom plaintiffs’ counsel have previously worked; and counsel need their help in analyzing more than 15,000 technical documents that Google has produced. Dkt. 216 at 4. Google suggests that the new experts aren’t needed because the plaintiffs already have eleven consulting experts working on the case. But given the large number of technical documents at issue, the Court won’t second guess the plaintiffs’ determination of how many experts they need.

Google worries that the new experts will use the information they acquire here to further a different case, *Brown v. Google LLC*, No. 20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK (N.D. Cal.), in which they are also consulting. The undersigned isn’t convinced that this “cross-pollination” will occur. Dkt. 216 at 4. If counsel or their experts violate the protective order by using protected material disclosed in this case in *Brown*, Google may seek relief. But there’s no evidence to date of such a violation.

Google’s objection is overruled.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: February 7, 2022



ALEX G. TSE  
United States Magistrate Judge